

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
AIKEN DIVISION

Richard E. Tedford, #365731,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 1:21-3718-HMH-SVH
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>OPINION &amp; ORDER</b>
	)	
	)	
Warden, Lieber Correctional Institution,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> Richard E. Tedford (“Tedford”) is a pro se prisoner seeking habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In her Report and Recommendation filed on March 23, 2022, Magistrate Judge Hodges recommends granting Respondent’s motion for summary judgment and dismissing Tedford’s petition with prejudice. (R&R, generally, ECF No. 20.)

Tedford filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation.<sup>2</sup> (Obj., generally, ECF No. 22.) Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file

---

<sup>1</sup> The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Tedford's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Hodges' Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that Respondent's motion for summary judgment, docket number 15, is granted. It is further

**ORDERED** that Tedford's § 2254 Petition, docket number 1, is dismissed with prejudice. It is further

**ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is denied because Tedford has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
April 6, 2022

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The Petitioner is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.